



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/702,689	11/06/2003	Vinay Mehta	FDN-2815	8995

7590 06/05/2007
GAF MATERIALS CORPORATION
Attn: William J. Davis, Esq.
Legal Department, Building No. 10
1361 Alps Road
Wayne, NJ 07470

EXAMINER

COLE, ELIZABETH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/05/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/702,689

Applicant(s)

MEHTA ET AL.

Examiner

Elizabeth M. Cole

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 9-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 9-18 and 30-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 1771

1. Claims 1-5, 9-17, 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification as originally filed does not provide support for the limitation that, that the film or coated laminate has a minimum moisture vapor transmission rate of greater than 2 grams per square meter per day but less than 500 grams per square meter per day.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 10, 12-14, 17, 18, 30, 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albertone et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,645,336 in view of WO 9637668 and Krueger, U.S. Patent No. 5,691,034. Albertone discloses a breathable film which may comprise polyether, polyurethane, polyether ester, polyether amide, polyvinyl alcohol polymers and copolymers. See col. 4, lines 37-56. The breathable film is bonded to a substrate such as a polyolefin nonwoven fabric. See col. 5, lines 45- col. 7, lines 3. A tie layer of copolymers comprising ethylene vinyl acetate can be used

to facilitate bonding between the film and nonwoven substrate layer. With regard to claim 17, claim 17 recites a statement of intended use and does not structurally further limit the structure set forth in claim 1. The laminated film is useful in roofing. The thickness of the film encompasses the claimed range. See 20-60 um. While Albertone does not particularly state the claimed MVTR, since Albertone teaches employing a permeable film, and teaches that the permeability of the film can be controlled by controlling various factors such as the thickness of the layers and/or the chain length of the polymer, (see col. 12, lines 28-44), therefore, Albertone teaches that the MVTR is a result effective variable and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected the desired MVTR through the process of routine experimentation which had the optimum MVTR. Albertone differs from the claimed invention because while Albertone teaches that the substrate can be any woven or nonwoven material, it does not specifically teach that the substrate is a glass fiber fabric. WO '668 teaches at page 8, fourth full paragraph, that substrates which comprise mineral fibers are equivalent to substrates which comprise organic fibers for use as the fibrous substrate in forming roof underlayments. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed a glass fiber substrate as the fibrous substrate in Albertone, motivated by the teaching of WO '668 that such substrates were recognized in the art as equivalents for this purpose.

4. Albertone does not disclose adding either a silane agent or a maleic anhydride grated polypropylene to the underlayment as an adhesion promoter. Krueger teaches

Art Unit: 1771

at col. 6, lines 55-66, that tie layers in structures such as Albertone may further comprise adhesion promoters such as silanes and maleic anhydride modified polymers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the adhesion promoting agents of Krueger in the tie layers of Albertone in order to improve and facilitate the bonding of the layers.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albertone et al, U.S Patent no. 6,645,336 in view of WO 9637668 and Krueger as set forth above, and further in view of Kuhnel et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,511,619. Albertone discloses a breathable laminate which comprises a film layer and a fabric substrate layer.

Albertone does not teach disposing the film on both sides of the fabric substrate layer. Kuhnel teaches that in forming roofing materials that the film can be disposed on both sides of the fabric so that the fabric can strengthen the film. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have disposed film layers on both sides of the substrate in Albertone, in order to allow the substrate to fully strength the film layers.

6. Claims 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albertone et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,645,336 in view of WO 9637668 and Krueger as set forth above, and further in view of Kirchberger et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,300,257.

Albertone discloses a breathable laminate as set forth above. Albertone does not disclose that the polymer layer or the tie layer comprises methyl methacrylate.

Kirchberger teaches that methyl methacrylate can be added to layers of breathable roofing materials in order to improve the interlaminar bonding strength of layers which

Art Unit: 1771

contain ethylene copolymers. See col. 3, lines 9-17. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added methyl methacrylate to the tie layers and film layers of Albertone, motivated by the expectation that this would further enhance the interlaminar bonding strength of the material.

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albertone in view of WO 9637668 and Krueger as applied to claims above, and further in view of EP 1,245,620. Albertone teaches a roofing underlayment as set forth above. Albertone does not disclose incorporating additives into the breathable layer. EP '620 discloses a breathable film material comprising a polyolefin resin such as polypropylene which is laminated to a substrate such as a polyolefin nonwoven fabric. See paragraph 0001. The material is suitable for use in forming waterproofing sheets for roofs. The film may further comprise additives such as alumina to impart heat and flame resistance. See paragraph 0009. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added flame retardants such as those taught in EP '620 to the underlayment of Albertone, motivated by the expectation that this would impart flame retardant properties to the underlayment of Albertone.

8. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 10, 12-14, 17, 18, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albertone et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,645,336 in view of WO 9637668 and George et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,282,283. Albertone discloses a breathable film which may comprise polyether, polyurethane, polyether ester, polyether

Art Unit: 1771

amide, polyvinyl alcohol polymers and copolymers. See col. 4, lines 37-56. The breathable film is bonded to a substrate such as a polyolefin nonwoven fabric. See col. 5, lines 45-col. 7, lines 3. A tie layer of copolymers comprising ethylene vinyl acetate can be used to facilitate bonding between the film and nonwoven substrate layer. With regard to claim 17, claim 17 recites a statement of intended use and does not structurally further limit the structure set forth in claim 1. The laminated film is useful in roofing. The thickness of the film encompasses the claimed range. See 20-60 μm . While Albertone does not particularly state the claimed MVTR, since Albertone teaches employing a permeable film, and teaches that the permeability of the film can be controlled by controlling various factors such as the thickness of the layers and/or the chain length of the polymer, (see col. 12, lines 28-44), therefore, Albertone teaches that the MVTR is a result effective variable and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected the desired MVTR through the process of routine experimentation which had the optimum MVTR. Albertone differs from the claimed invention because while Albertone teaches that the substrate can be any woven or nonwoven material, it does not specifically teach that the substrate is a glass fiber fabric. WO '668 teaches at page 8, fourth full paragraph, that substrates which comprise mineral fibers are equivalent to substrates which comprise organic fibers for use as the fibrous substrate in forming roof underlayments. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed a glass fiber substrate as the fibrous substrate in Albertone, motivated

by the teaching of WO '668 that such substrates were recognized in the art as equivalents for this purpose.

9. Albertone does not disclose adding a titanate coupling agent to the underlayment as an adhesion promoter. George et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,282,283 teaches in example 1 that titanate coupling agents may be added to compositions in order to facilitate the bonding of a polymeric material and a fiberglass fabric. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the adhesion promoting agents of George in the tie layers of Albertone in order to improve and facilitate the bonding of the layers.

10. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albertone et al, U.S Patent no. 6,645,336 in view of WO 9637668 and George as set forth above, and further in view of Kuhnel et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,511,619. Albertone discloses a breathable laminate which comprises a film layer and a fabric substrate layer.

Albertone does not teach disposing the film on both sides of the fabric substrate layer. Kuhnel teaches that in forming roofing materials that the film can be disposed on both sides of the fabric so that the fabric can strengthen the film. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have disposed film layers on both sides of the substrate in Albertone, in order to allow the substrate to fully strength the film layers.

11. Claims 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albertone et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,645,336 in view of WO 9637668 and George as set forth above, and further in view of Kirchberger et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,300,257.

Art Unit: 1771

Albertone discloses a breathable laminate as set forth above. Albertone does not disclose that the polymer layer or the tie layer comprises methyl methacrylate.

Kirchberger teaches that methyl methacrylate can be added to layers of breathable roofing materials in order to improve the interlaminar bonding strength of layers which contain ethylene copolymers. See col. 3, lines 9-17. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added methyl methacrylate to the tie layers and film layers of Albertone, motivated by the expectation that this would further enhance the interlaminar bonding strength of the material.

12. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albertone in view of WO 9637668 and George as applied to claims above, and further in view of EP 1,245,620. Albertone teaches a roofing underlayment as set forth above. Albertone does not disclose incorporating additives into the breathable layer. EP '620 discloses a breathable film material comprising a polyolefin resin such as polypropylene which is laminated to a substrate such as a polyolefin nonwoven fabric. See paragraph 0001. The material is suitable for use in forming waterproofing sheets for roofs. The film may further comprise additives such as alumina to impart heat and flame resistance. See paragraph 0009. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added flame retardants such as those taught in EP '620 to the underlayment of Albertone, motivated by the expectation that this would impart flame retardant properties to the underlayment of Albertone.

13. Applicant's arguments filed 3/28/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

14. Applicant's arguments are sufficient to remove the 112 1st paragraph rejection with regard to the thickness of the film and that the film is a coatable laminate, but the rejection is maintained with regard to the MVTR, since this range is not disclosed in the specification and is not disclosed as being critical in the specification. The specification does not provide support for the particular claim range and does not recite either end point, but instead merely recites a minimum value for the MVTR.

15. Applicant argues that WO '668 does not teach how to adhere the breathable film to the glass fiber layer. However, Albertone already teaches how to make the breathable film and teaches that the fabric layer can be "any fabric". WO '668 is relied on to show the equivalence of mineral fibers and synthetic fibers for this purpose.

16. Applicant argues that none of the reference teach an adhesion improvement component added to the underlayment. This argument is moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

17. Applicant disagrees that the selection of the MVTR would have been obvious through the process of routine experimentation and that the instant MVTR was not done with routine experimentation but through a rigorous selection process. However, the rejection does not state that Applicant discovered the MVTR through routine experimentation, but rather states that Albertone teaches that the MVTR can be controlled and therefore, the person of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to

Art Unit: 1771

have selected the desired MVTR through the process of routine experimentation which had the optimum MVTR in view of the teaching of Albertone that the MVTR is directly related to various factors such as the thickness of the layers and/or the chain length of the polymer, (see col. 12, lines 28-44).

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth M. Cole whose telephone number is (571) 272-1475. The examiner may be reached between 6:30 AM and 6:00 PM Monday through Wednesday, and 6:30 AM and 2 PM on Thursday.

Art Unit: 1771

Mr. Terrel Morris, the examiner's supervisor, may be reached at (571) 272-1478.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

The fax number for all official faxes is (571) 273-8300.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Elizabeth M. Cole", is positioned above the printed name.

Elizabeth M. Cole
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1771

e.m.c